

**Drawings:**

Referring to FIG. 1, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, what is illustrated in Fig. 1 is not "old". Further, MPEP, Section 608.02(g) to which the Examiner cites is suggestive and does not mandate the use of the term "prior art." The Applicant is not aware of any requirements in the MPEP or the related statutes or case law that require the use of such exact label, instead of "related art" which the Applicant finds more appropriate in this instance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to support his contention for the suggested change by citing to an appropriate portion of the MPEP or case law that mandate the use of a specific term, or otherwise withdraw the respective objection.

To expedite prosecution, FIG. 1 has been amended by way of a replacement sheet to read "Prior Art." The Applicant, however, maintains that such change is not mandated.

Referring to FIG. 3, the specification is amended to include '(S340)' and therefore the objection to FIG. 3 is now moot.